

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/816,052	03/31/2004	Thomas A. Piazza	42P19136	9615	
45209 7590 10/22/2009 INTEL/BSTZ BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			EXAMINER		
			CRAWFORD, JACINTA M		
	279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY UNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
gerari vilizi, erry toob to to			2628	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/22/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/816,052	PIAZZA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JACINTA CRAWFORD	2628		
SHOWEN CHANGE	2020		

	JACINTA CRAWFORD	2628				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
The period for reply expires months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). DIX / CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMELINATION.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	u o o o u o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o		DTOL 004)			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):     Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
Ton-anowable claim(s).  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [     how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Kee M Tung/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue regarding independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 29 on pages 7.9 of the after-final amendment that the prior art cited does not teach the limitations of the claims, more specifically, "to block a thread from dispatching to the graphics engine" (claim 1). However, as stated in the previous Office Action, regarding independent claims 1 and 23, Rosenbluth teaches signaling for threads to begin within a pipestage (1082). A thread does not begin until this signal is received. This is to maintaining strict sequential ordering of the execution of the threads in a given stage (1083). Rosenbluth may not explicitly use the term "dispatch," however, it is obvious that the threads are dispatched as sense a thread is not provided for execution until signaled. Therefore, a thread not "released" within a pipestage until ready to begin execution within the pipestage is interpreted as "blocking a thread from dispatching to the graphics engine." Regarding independent claims 11 and 18, Chrysos discloses threads or instructions being in-flight from the time it is dispatched until retires or aborts. A bit is used to indicate an "in-flight" thread and remains asserted until the thread aborts or retires (column 14, line 55 thm column 15, line 3). Thinders or "blocks" other instructions or threads from being dispatched and executed. Therefore, it is also interpreted that Chrysos' teaching of not "releasing" a thread and frend from dispatching."